

the Plan (IV 62) and it is expected that 50 percent of the seasonal streams (Type 5) will be protected as a result of the mass-wasting protection provisions. The other 50 percent of Type 5 streams receive interim protections as necessary and will be addressed within the Type 5 research and adaptive-management component to be completed within the first 10 years of the Plan. Watershed Analysis can only increase, not decrease, the level of protection these streams receive. Road management is another critical component of the Department of Natural Resources' Plan (IV 62-68).

Provisions for the Olympic Experimental State Forest are described in the Plan on pages IV 81-86, 106-121. In general, the strategy for the Olympic Experimental State Forest provides conservation very similar to the remainder of the Department of Natural Resources Plan, but a higher emphasis is placed on research, landscape assessments, and validation monitoring.

These minimization and mitigation measures described above represent the minimum level of riparian conservation the Department of Natural Resources will provide under the Plan. Several aspects of the Plan, including riparian protection, are subject to adaptive management. To ensure that the mitigation and minimization strategies are effective, the Plan incorporates a variety of aquatic monitoring components that will provide feedback for adaptive management and, if needed, increase riparian protection.

Dated: June 11, 1998.

**Ronald E. Lambertson,**

*Acting Regional Director, Region 1, Portland, Oregon.*

[FR Doc. 98-16056 Filed 6-16-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-55-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### Bureau of Land Management

[MT-924-1430-01; MTM 41504]

### Public Land Order No. 7340; Opening of Lands Under Section 24 of the Federal Power Act; Montana

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Land Management, Interior.

**ACTION:** Public Land Order.

**SUMMARY:** This order opens 1,278.84 acres of public lands in Bureau of Land Management Powersite Classification No. 334, subject to the provisions of Section 24 of the Federal Power Act. This action will permit disposal of the lands through a pending exchange and retain the waterpower rights to the

United States. The lands are temporarily closed to surface entry and mining due to the pending exchange. The lands have been and will remain open to mineral leasing.

**EFFECTIVE DATE:** June 17, 1998.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Sandra Ward, BLM Montana State Office, P.O. Box 36800, Billings, Montana 59107-6800, 406-255-2949, or Susie Williams, BLM Headwaters Resource Area, P.O. Box 3388, Butte, Montana 59702-3388, 406-494-5059.

By virtue of the authority vested in the Secretary of the Interior by the Act of June 10, 1920, Section 24, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 818 (1994), and pursuant to the determination by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in DVMT-243 and DVMT-247, it is ordered as follows:

1. At 9:00 a.m. on June 17, 1998, the following described public lands withdrawn by the Secretarial Order dated February 18, 1943, which established Powersite Classification No. 334, will be opened to disposal by exchange, subject to the provisions of Section 24 of the Federal Power Act, and subject to valid existing rights, the provisions of existing withdrawals, other segregations of record, and the requirements of applicable law:

**Principal Meridian, Montana**

T. 2 S., R. 9 E.,

Sec. 34, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ .

T. 3 S., R. 9 E.,

Sec. 2, lot 2, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ , and SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 10, all.

T. 4 S., R. 9 E.,

Sec. 20, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$  and SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 30, lots 3 and 4, and E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ ;

Sec. 32, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ .

The areas described aggregate 1,278.84 acres in Park County.

2. The State of Montana was afforded timely notice to file an application for a reservation to the State for any lands required as a right-of-way for a highway, or as a source of materials for the construction and maintenance of such highways in accordance with the provisions of Section 24 of the Federal Power Act of June 10, 1920, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 818 (1994).

Dated: June 4, 1998.

**Bob Armstrong,**

*Assistant Secretary of the Interior.*

[FR Doc. 98-16031 Filed 6-16-98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4310-DN-P

## DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

### National Park Service

### Keweenaw National Historical Park

**AGENCY:** National Park Service, Interior.

**ACTION:** Notice of Availability.

**SUMMARY:** Availability of Final General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Keweenaw National Historical Park in Houghton County, Michigan.

Pursuant to section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the National Park Service (NPS) announces the availability of the final General Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (GMP/FEIS) for Keweenaw National Historical Park. The draft General Management Plan/Draft Environmental Impact Statement for the park was on a 60-day public review from August 29, 1997, to October 31, 1997.

The NPS will manage resources it owns in the Quincy and Calumet Units and provide interpretive and other services in conjunction with the programs of Keweenaw National Historical Park as described in the GMP/FEIS. The action is in response to a mandate by Congress in Public Law 102-543, an Act to establish Keweenaw National Historical Park (16 U.S.C. 410yy *et seq.*). The GMP/FEIS was prepared by the NPS.

The NPS's preferred alternative for Keweenaw National Historical Park is identified in the GMP/FEIS as Alternative 4 (The Proposed Action). Under the preferred alternative, the NPS would manage NPS-owned resources and work cooperatively with landowners, local and state government agencies, and others to protect cultural and historical resources associated with the copper-mining heritage of the park. Alternative 4 includes a combination of technical and financial assistance, and a traditional park concept. The goal is to create a dynamic national park area where the NPS has a strong public presence and, through community assistance, is a contributing member of a very organized and active partnership of local government and community groups. The park boundary will remain unchanged. Any recommendations to revise the park's boundary would be developed through a future boundary study process that would include public involvement. Congressional approval would be required for any boundary changes.

Three other alternatives are also considered: Alternative 1—No Action, projects a scenario of static or reduced fiscal resources available for the management of the park resulting in a caretaker mode of operation. Alternative 2—Community Assistance, emphasizes community assistance and partnership cooperation to manage and protect